

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/919,221	07/31/2001	Danny C. Vogel	5201-23900 01-138	4596	
7590 07/12/2005			EXAM	EXAMINER	
Leo J. Peters			BLOUNT, STEVEN		
LSI Logic Corp	oration			· - · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
1551 McCarthy Blvd., MS D-106			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Milpitas, CA 95035			2661		

DATE MAILED: 07/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		09/919,221	VOGEL, DANNY C.			
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit			
	•	Steven Blount	2661			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication		ith the correspondence address			
Period for	or Reply					
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failt Any	HORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REMAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFI r SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, and period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by streply received by the Office later than three months after the mand patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a note of the control of	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. SANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3	1 July 2001.				
2a)□						
3)□						
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1 - 25</u> is/are pending in the applicate 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1 - 11, 18 - 22, 24 - 25</u> is/are rejected to. Claim(s) <u>12 - 17 and 23</u> is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction are	drawn from consideration.				
Applicat	ion Papers					
9)[The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.				
10)	☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
	Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abeyar	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
_	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor		` ' '			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the	e Examiner. Note the attached	J Office Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
. а)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docum application from the International But See the attached detailed Office action for a	ents have been received. ents have been received in A priority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage			
Attachmen	nt(s)					
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)			
3) 🛛 Infor	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB er No(s)/Mail Date		s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 09/919,221

Art Unit: 2661

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 6,888,825 to Liu in view of U.S. patent 6,049,540 to Chrin et al.

Liu teaches data streams 1, 2, ...k (see fig 2, area near buffer 11) which have the data sequentially placed into buffers 110 (see figure 1) wherein multiplexors select bits from any of the shift registers (see the connection dots in figure 1) and then insert them into output lines 1, ...k which connect to LC100A, LC100B, ... as shown in figure 1, wherein these streams are ultimately fed along a data line to line card 100J, as shown at the bottom of figure 2.

Liu does not, however, specifically define the buffers to be "shift registers" per se (although applicant apparently does not make the distinction between shift registers and buffers – see page 22 line 15).

Chrin et al teaches a similar system wherein shift registers are used. See figure 5, S11 – 1.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used shift registers in Liu in light of the teachings of Chrin et al in

Application/Control Number: 09/919,221

Art Unit: 2661

order to provide an effective means for presenting the data to the multiplexors for the process of time slot interchange (col 3 line 50).

With regard to claim 2, TDM is mentioned in col 1 line 26.

With regard to claim 3, a plurality of multiplexors and synchronous clock action is taught in Liu.

With regard to claim 4, 2 is an obvious variation of the multiple number of shift registers.

With regard to claim 5, the TSI operation claimed is inherent in the process taught in Liu.

With regard to claims 6 – 9, see the rejections above.

3. Claims 10 – 11, and 18 - 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. patent 6,785,261 to Schuster et al in view of U.S. patent 5,581,790 to Sefidvash.

With regard to claim 10, Schuster et al teaches problems inherent in a packetized telephony network wherein where there is corrupted or missing data, and presents a solution to this problem which comprises replacing the correct data in the correct location in the buffer which contains the said corrupted or missing data. Schuster et al does not however teach comparing *signal bits* utilizing a *comparison register*, and notifying a DSP prior to the replacement.

Sefidvash teaches comparing an *error detection code* (ie, signal bits) using a *comparison register* (register 14, col 7 lines 5+ and col 7 lines 48+ and col 8 lines 23+) and if parity is not found, the control processor is interrupted (col 8 lines 65+).

Application/Control Number: 09/919,221

Art Unit: 2661

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have provided proper error correction for signal bits in Schuster et al through the use of a comparison register and comparator, in light of the teachings of Sefidvash, in order to place less stress on the DSP in a changing environment.

With regard to claim 11, note the use of multiple protocol controller busses 6 in col 5 lines 45+.

With regard to claims 18 - 19, see the rejection of claims 10 – 11 above.

With regard to claim 20, there are multiple input voice channels in Schuster et al.

With regard to claim 21, it would be obvious to use a plurality of input registers

14.

With regard to claim 22, see col 8 lines 65+ of Sefidvash.

4. Claims 24 – 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. patent 5,497,373 to Hulen et al in view of U.S. patent 5,999,529 to Bernstein et al.

With regard to claim 24, Hulen et al teach processors 24 – 34, and TSI 20, but do not teach the internal circuitry necessary to process packets in an ATM mode, including a pcp and sar.

Bernstein et al teach a TSI operable in an ATM environment, which includes the use of an equivalent of a pcp (230, see col 4 line 25) and the equivalent of a sar (450 col 4, lines 40+).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have provided Hulen et al with a pcp and sar, in light of the teachings of Bernstein et al, in order to provide a means for communicating with a plurality of DSP's

Application/Control Number: 09/919,221 Page 5

Art Unit: 2661

In an ATM system over a TSI.

5. Claims 12 – 17 and 23 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the limitations

of the base claim and any intervening claims.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Steven Blount whose telephone number is 571 - 272 -

3071. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00 - 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Mr. Chau Nguyen, can be reached on 571 – 272 - 3126. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ajit Patel

∆Y3 6/25/05